RAJYA SABHA

Monday, the 1st June, 1998/
Jyaistha 11, 1920 (Saka)

The House met at Eleven of the Clock **Mr. Chairman** in the Chair.

MEMBER SWORN

Shri Oscar Fernandes (Karnataka).

OBITUARY REFERENCE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I refer with profound sorrow to the passing away of Shri Bishambar Nath Pande, a former Member of the Rajya Sabha, last night at the age of 92.

Born at Umrath in District Chhindwara of Madhya Pradesh in December, 1996 Shri Pande was educated at Chhindwara, Adyar in Tamil Nadu and Vishwa Bharati Santiniketan. An erudite scholar, author and editor and a freedom fighter, Shri Pande was associated with the Indian National Congress since 1921 and participated under the leadership of Gandhiji in the Non-cooperation and Satyagraha movements. He suffered imprisonment eight times. In 1942, he participated in the Jhanda Satyagraha with Pandit Sunderlal with whom he founded the Hindustani Sewa Dal. He was associated with various organisations and bodies. Shri Pande was the founder-President of the Uttar Pradesh Bank Employees Union from 1946 to 1948. He was Chairman of the Allahabad Municipal Board from August, 1948 to July, 1953 and he also served as Mayor of the Allahabad Municipal Corporation from 1960 to 1961. He was the Vice-Chairman of the Local-Self Government Municipal Corporation Act Amendment Committee of the Government of Uttar Pradesh from 1972 to 1974. Shri Pande was also a member of the Indian Culture Commission, UNESCO from 1955 to 1958, of the Kendriya Hindi Parishad in 1982, and of a number of centenary celebration committees of national leaders. Shri Pande also had a number of publications to his credit. He was the Principal Editor of *The Spirit of India* and the General Editor of the *Centenary History of the Indian National Congrees, 1885-1985.*

Shri Pande started his legislative career as a Member of the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha from 1952 to 1953 and the Vidhan Parishad from 1972 to 1974. He was nominated to the Rajya Sabha from April, 1976 to April, 1982. Thereafter, he was elected from the State of Uttar Pradesh in April, 1982 to June, 1983 and was again a Nominated Member of the Rajya Sabha from November, 1988 to November, 1994.

Shri Pande was the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Vishwa Bharati University (Amendment) Bill, 1981 to 1982. He was a member on the Panel of Vice-Chairman from 1980 to 1982.

Shri Pande also served as the Governor of Orissa from 1983 to 1988. He was a recipient of the Padma Shri.

In the passing away of Shri Bishambhar Nath Pande, the country has lost a veteran freedom fighter, a distinguished parliamentarian and an able administrator.

We deeply mourn the passing away of Shri Bishambhar Nath Pande.

(*Hon. Members then stood in silence for one minute*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Secretary-General will convey to the members of the bereaved family our sense of profound sorrow and deep sympathy.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Government control in Dunlop India Ltd.

*61. SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE :†
SHRI NILOTPAL BASU:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government in a bid to wrest control in Dunlop India Ltd. is seeking appointment of additional Directors on the Board of the Company;

(b) whether the move follows investigations which revealed financial irregularities in affairs of Dunlop;

(c) if so, whether Government is proposing to takeover the Company under Section 18-AA of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951; and

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Dipankar Mukherjee.

(d) if not, the reason therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT:

(a) to (d) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) and (b) The Department of Company Affairs had ordered the inspection of books of accounts of M\s. Dunlop India Limited under Section 209 A of the Companies Act 1956, based on a complaint received from Dunlop Workers Union. In the light of violations and irregularities noticed during inspection, Central Government has moved a petition under Section 408 of the Companies Act before the Company Law Board for appointment of Government Directors on the Board of the Company. The matter at present is subjudice.

(c) and (d) Section 18-AA of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 provides for taking over of industrial undertakings by Central Government in certain cases. As reported to the Parliament in the Annual Report of the Minister of Industry for the year 1996—1997, the policy of Government of India is not to take over any sick units under the provision of Industries (Development and Regulation) Act. As such, there is no proposal to take over the company under Section 18-AA of the IDR Act.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, this is my maiden question to the Leader of the House, so I crave your indulgence to give me a little more time. Sir, the reply gives an idea as if we are dealing with a sick company. Unfortunately, Dunlop India's case on which I have put the question is not pertaining to a sick company. It is a classic case of corporate terrorism, diversion of money, leading a very, very viable, blue-chip company, towards sickness, absolutely caused by man, a corporate terrorist sitting in Dubai. It is not a sick company. The very reply given in part (c) and (d) of the question is that the policy of the Government is not to take over any sick unit. I beg to submit to the hon. Minister that its sickness itself has been questioned not by the unions alone, by the bankers, the Government's nationalised banks-the United Bank of India and all other consortiums of banks have questioned that there is an artificial sickness and this company is not sick at all. Sir, Dunlop India is a blue-chip company. It manufactures—there is a notion that it manufactures only tyres—aero-tyres, its monopoly product which is used in defence; it manufactures OTRs (Off-the-road tyres) used for agricultural tractors and all. It is very much in the process of being run. It employs 7,000 people—West Bengal, one unit; there is another unit in Tamil Nadu. Sir, I quote from the Annual Report of 1996—97 wherein the management says, "The company has reached achievement-studded record and has contributed substantially to the state of national exchequer for over six decades. While in recent times we have to face some ups and downs, the company through its dint of hard work and sustained efforts at all employee-levels, managed to record several successes." Then what is the problem? This is the report of 1996—97 placed before the AGM in August, 1997. The only problem before this company, as the Annual Report says, is, "It is, therefore, absolutely imperative that the banks",— Government of India banks,—"and financial institutions take a more realistic attitude towards funding in order to further Dunlops development programmes and ensure the company's strong fundamentals."

Why are banks not giving money? They have enough reasons to say that this money was not being utilised for Dunlop it was being diverted. Its econmic offender is perpetrating this type of corporate terrorism. That is why when a complaint has gone to the Department of Company Affairs, the Government of India, in its wisdom, has decided, it is convinced, that there is a financial mismanagement in the company. They have asked for nine additional directors in the Dunlop Board which means that the Government wants to have a major share not in the company but in the management. What have I been asking for? I am saying that the operation has been suspended for the last six months. Seven thousand workers are not getting salary for the last seven months. It can be started only if the money is made available from the banks. And banks would not give money to this corporate terrorist. I have said that instead of going to the Company Law Board under section 408, you have a statute, you have an ideal Act, Mr. Minister. Section 18-AA specifically stipulates that sickness is not an issue. It is, if there is a financial mismanagement, I can read

it out to the whole House; it stipulates that if there is a financial mismanagement, if there is siphoning off of the money, if you are satisfied with that, you can take over the managment temporarily and production can be restarted. It is ready for production and it can be restarted. What prohibits you? You say, it is *sub judice, sub judice* in the Company Law Board under section 408. What prohibits you from applying 18-AA against this company to take over when you are convinced that there is a financial mismanagement?

This is my first supplementary.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Besides the question, whatever the hon. Member has said, I agree with every word he uttered. He is right. As far as the question is concerned, the case is before the BIFR. This company has gone before the BIFR according to law. They have the right to go to the BIFR and the matter is *sub judice* in two courts: number one, the hon. Member himself mentioned in his own observations so cogently and number two, the workers also have gone to the Calcutta High Court. They also have gone to the Court. Anyway, they are *sub judice* in two courts. Number one, before the BIFR and number two, unless the BIFR finishes off its deliberations, it is number three. The BIFR, after they took a meeting on the 31st March, 1998, examined so many persons. Most of the persons said whatever the hon. Member has said. The banks are also very unhappy. They do not want to call this concern a sick unit at all. Therefore, the non-cooperation of the banks is justified from their own point of view. The moment we finish with the BIFR, we will see as to what action we can take. I agree with the hon. Member that this company's case is a very complex case. Till 1996—97 they have shown profits. They have even distributed dividents, etc. They are not in a loss. This gentleman, about whom you have mentioned—you did not take the name and I also would not take the name—is not in India. He has been prosecuted in whatever way it could be done.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: I am happy that he has agreed with certain things. Now the second supplementary. I will quote from Mr. Advani's words. Seven thousand people....

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Seven thousand five hundred.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: For the last five-seven months the company has suspended its operation, as you agree with me. I use the word 'corporate terrorists'. Now I use Mr. Advani's words. When the terrorist issue is being discussed, what role should the Government play? Is it to be pro-active or reactive? He wants the country to follow the route of pro-active. I do not think it is a matter to be laughed at. It is a labour issue. It is a serious issue. Sir, you are in the Chair; that is why I seek your indulgence.

You have been raising the issues. Is it that the pro-active stand is taken only in the case of political and other terrorists, and not in the case of economic terrorists? This is nothing but a case of financial mismanagement. We will react to whatever rules, laws and sub-laws are there. I say this is the Act before you, again I say this is the Act before you, why cannot you follow the advice of Mr. Advaniji and take a proactive stand in the case of M/s. Dunlop, and grow it and temporarily take over the management? There are so many professionals available. Take them in to the management and run this company. What relief, what concessions, what signal are you sending to the 10,000 workers and shareholders in public interest? Have you gone to the Company's Law Board? What is the pro-active stand of this Government *vis-a-vis* M/s. Dunlop?

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Sir, that is very good English. There is no doubt about it. I appreciate it. I did not want to give any cold answer to his question because I know that the situtation is very complex. But, we have got to go by certain rules. I was intending to read out ...*(Interruptions)*... Just a minute. I was intending to read out every flagged answer to your question. There is an answer. But, I think, it would not do justice to the whole situation. It will have to be dealt with and dealt with as expeditiously as possible. Please give us time. That is my request. I can read out a reply to your question about Sections 15 and 18A (a). I can do it. But, I don't like to do it because unfortunately I am also feeling the same way as you are feeling.

It has been a case of absolute mischief by a person who took over this organization in 1984. Then, he suddenly disappeared from the country. And for two years he has not been coming here. There is no point, and nobody can say that M/s. Dunlop is a sick company. I agree with you.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, it is very strange that Shri Sikander Bakht *saheb* shares most of our views on this question. But, the very way in which the question has been drafted shows that the BIFR's case is a very important issue. Then, I am afraid that the statement laid in the House today will prejudice the views of the BIFR because we have been arguing the very fact that it is not a sick company. Now, the BIFR had actually authorised the IDBI to make a study. The IDBI has also come up with a study and they have actually substantiated what we were saying, that it is not a sick company. There has been fudging of accounts and there has been— what he is talking as—corporate terrorism. But, the point is that the Government refers to the relevant section of the Annual Report of the Ministry of Industry for the year 1996—97 saying that such is the policy for sick companies. As the company under consideration, that is, M/s. Dunlop, is a sick company, it strengthens and reinforces the idea that M/s. Dunlop is a sick company. So, I charge with a very havy heart that this Government is giving a statement in the House which substantiates the claims of the company and it will prejudice the case which is going on before the BIFR. Therefore, what we are saying is that the terms, the Act, under which the whole case has been referred to, is extraneous to the application of Section 18A(a), and there should be nothing which comes in the way of invoking Section 18(A), and taking over temporarily the management of M/s. Dunlop. We would like the Minister to respond to this.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: As I have said, if any prejudice can be generated by whatever we are talking here, the prejudice so generated should be in favour of the fact that M/s. Dunlop is not a sick company. Really, I do not mean to disagree with the hon. Member. ...(*Interruptions*)....That is what the company has claimed ....(*Interruptions*)....Just a minute....(*Interruptions*)....That is what the company has claimed. We are fully conscious of what is happening there. We are finding out the means to deal with the situation.

If you like, I can continue to go on giving you flat answers. There is no difficulty. But I don't want to do it because I am in agreement with you, whatever you own apprehensions are. This is a unique case, this is a very complex case where the Company has itself tried to put the Company in the red. We do not agree with that.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, as the Minister himself has admitted while responding to Mr. Depankar Mukherjee's query that the Company is not sick and there is likely to be a case of diversion of funds which has created an artificial sickness so far as this Company is concerned, in that connection, I would like to know—he has referred to BIFR also—whether it should have been referred to BIFR or not. I am not going into that academic aspect as it has gone to the BIFR and BIFR has also come out with a certain package where they had made some recommendations. But two questions are arising here. While replying to the first question he referred to the point that banks and financial institutions are reluctant to fund the Company. Why? Because, they are not quite sure whether under the present management if they give funds to the Company, perhaps there is a likelihood of diversion and the Company will not be put on the road of recovery.

I would like to know whether this contention is correct. If so, then some suggestion have been made by my colleagues for taking it over temporarily under 18 AA. I am not going into the sickness aspect of it. Sickness aspect comes under clause B of this relevant section. But clause A of Section 18 AA deals with a doubt in regard to the mismanagement of funds, wrong investment and creating artificial inumbancy. In that occasion, if the Government is satisfied that the present management is indulging in this type of activity they can temporarily take it over. In this connection, when he referred to *sub judice*—perhaps, I think, if I understand him correctly from the statement—the matter is *sub judice* in regard to the petition which the Government has moved under Company Law, Section 408. But nothing prevents Government, if it applies its mind to take over under Section 18 AA of IDR Act. Thank you.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Thank you, very much. Basically, I have answered your

questions already. Since the case is before the BIFR, BIFR has entered into a very extensive exercise and it has given four weeks time to a Committee to look into the case. The Committee's report has been submitted on the 15th of May, and they are going to come forward with their recommendation which I am sure will be in the light of whatever the situation in the management of the Dunlop Company is today. We cannot take over unless the BIFR finishes off with its exercise. I am not even pleading much about the case for *sub judice*, practically it is *sub judice*, there is no doubt. But I am not claiming it. What I am saying is that the constraints on the Government are because of the fact that the case was taken to the BIFR by the Government and that was absolutely legal, the way they had taken the case to the BIFR. Therefore, we are waiting for the final exercise of the BIFR, which should be close by, it cannot be very far away.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, while the hon. Minister agrees with the submission made by my other colleagues, he defers on the question of taking action and he defers because the matter is pending before the BIFR and a case has been instituted in the High Court. It is not for me to advise the hon. Minister, but may I put a question: What prevents the Government from making an application of the BIFR, the trade unions, and the workers, and the governments together. Let both the parties jointly apply to the BIFR. ...suggesting that it is not a sick company; and that the Government has madeup its mind to take over the management temporarily, in view of the fact that it has been mismanaged; therefore, we suggest that you kindly dispose it of expeditiously'. This is part (a) of my question. I would like to know whether any such joint application by the Government and the trade unions would be made. This is part (a).

Secondly, another problem that we face is that a case is pending before the High Court. There could be a similar application before the High Court also, saying that the Government wants to take over the company and that, therefore, the case may be withdrawn. If the Government makes up its mind in this way, to take over the management of the company, I can assure you that the trade unions would be too willing to withdraw their case.

Therefore, Sir, the legal problem, the so-called legal problem, that stands in the way of the Government taking drastic action could be taken care of by these two applications.

Sir, just half-a-minute more. I feel that the Government needs to take action in an exemplary way. I say this because Mr. Chhabra, who is the owner, who is evading arrest and living outside the country, had invested the latest technology of diverting funds. It is not in this case only. He had done the same thing in shaw Wallace and other companies. Therefore, the Government owes an explanation to the nation by taking exemplary action in this case. Let my hon. colleague react to the two modest suggestions that I have made.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Sir, as the hon. Member knows, taking action and taking over are two different things. The Government does intend to take action as.....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Will the Government make an application before the BIFR? Will the Government make an application before the High Court? (*Interruptions*) Making a statement in Parliament is welcome. But let the Government go before the BIFR and say the same thing. Let the Government go before the High Court and say the same thing.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I would request the hon. Member to kindly listen to me. Sir, the Government intends to take up the question very seriously. We are going to look into it very promptly. But we have to accept that we are under some legal constrainst. We cannot help it. The point is, the BIFR has to come forward with a total package. There are answers which are very flat. This is a very complicated question. I do not wish to give flat answers. Unfortunately or fortunately, I am in agreement with the hon. Members in regard to this whole case. But let us deal with it in the manner in which it is possible for us, without violating any legal constraint.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I need your protection. He is avoiding the question.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I am not avoiding the question. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jibon Roy.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Sir, I entirely agree with

my colleague, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta. This question does not concern only Dunlop. It concerns the entire industrial empire of Manu Chhabra. In a similar case, in the case of Shaw Wallace, the then Finance Minister, Shri Chidambaram, assured this House that eight Board directors would be inducted into the Shaw Wallace. The Finance Ministry went to the Company Law Board. But this thing could not be clinched even till now by the Government. As a result of this, all the money has been Swallowed. It has been diverted. He shifted the headquarters from Calcutta to Mumbai. The headquarters is actually in Dubai.

A Similar thing is happening in Dunlop. He would take away the whole money. If we have to buy the argument of the Government that this has to be cleared by the BIFR as well as by the High Court, nothing would happen. The factory would remain closed. On the other hand, if you agree, the workers would withdraw their case from the High Court. If the Government agrees to take over the company under section 18A, the trade unions would withdraw their case from the High Court.

Secondly, I have been concerned with the BIFR since the last few years. I know. If the Government appeals to the BIFR that they would like to take over the company, the BIFR would immediately release the company from under its purview.

In the meantime, another thing can be done. I would draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the State Government has said that if the Central Government agrees to take over the company, the State Government would temporarily take over the management of Dunlop.

Sir, as I said, it is not a question of Dunlop alone. It concerns the entire industrial empire of Manu Chhabra. He is finishing everything. It involes the employment of a number of people. It involes the economy of the country.

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, he is just making a statement. We have spent half-an-hour on this question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. You need not guide him. I am here to guide him.

SHRI JIBON ROY: Therefore, I wish that he reacts to that. There is no legal bar. In the answer itself he has said, "There is no proposal to take it over." It is a matter of Government decision. Government decision cannot be falt for every case. This is corporate terrorism. You have to act. I wish you will react over the matter.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I am sorry. The name of the gentleman who has been playing games with the funds of the Government of India....

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: I doubt whether he is a gentleman.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I have not taken the name of the gentleman because I wanted to avoid it. I also wanted to avoid the question where the money has been diverted to from the Dunlop India Co. Ltd. I know where it has gone. This will be totally beside the question that we are discussing about. I am again saying, "Give us time, please." We are very much conscious of whatever is happening. We are not going to let this Company go in the red.

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOUTRA: Sir, my colleague has raised a very important question. It is not only Dunlop. Dunlop is a sick company now. It is sick not becuase it deserves to be sick but becuase its funds were diverted out of this country. Its assets were stripped off. This is happening in very other company of the group. The same thing is happening in all the companies that were taken over by this gentleman. Others have gone to the BIFR. Some of the blueest-chip companies which are still functioning, are likely to go to the BIFR in the next six to twelve months. I want to ask of the Government whether it is going to wait in the case of Dunlop as they have waited in other cases and allow this company to go to the BIFR. This has been happening. I am sorry but I feel that there is some kind of work in tandem going on between some of these errant companies and the Government. It has happened in the case of healthy cigarette companies where thousands of crores of rupees were siphoned off over a period of time. The Government bore with all that. When they went to the BIFR, they said that they could do nothing. This is happening in the case of Dunlop. I urge upon this Government to take some action in the case of Shaw Wallace because this is going to happen

there also. Shaw Wallace was a blue-chip company in this country. It will be before the BIFR. Then we will hear in this House that we cannot do anything because it is before the BIFR. It is just not a case of a company going sick. Actually this criminal activity is going on in the company. Money is going out of this country. The way the takeover was structured on borrowed money, it had to happen. We knew about it. We talked about it. But the regret is that the Government has done nothing. In fact, maybe, it has played their game.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I am sorry, you are totally off the mark. I cannot answer questions about other companies right now. But I want to assure the hon. Member that the company is fully alive to the facts of the very complex situation of the Dunlop Company.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, the Minister is saying that the company is alive. He should say that the Government is alive.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You are not representing the company, but you are representing the Government. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: We are alive to the facts. We are taking action. We are not sleeping over it. We are taking action within the bounds, constraints of law etc. etc.

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN: Sir, I do agree that there are certain legal constraints. But these legal constrainsts can be overcome provided the Government takes certain definite decisions on what is to be done. Here one suggestion is that the management should be temporarily taken over under section 18AA of the Industries (Developmen and Regulation) Act. The Government has really given an evasive reply here. What has been stated here in this written reply is:

> "As reported to the Parliament in the Annual Report of the Ministry of Industry for the year 1996-97, the policy of the Government of India, is not to take over any sick units under the provisions of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act."

Of course, at that time, the Government has taken a decision. But the Government is free and has the liberty to change the decision today and take a definite decision with regard to this particular issue. May I know from tne hon. Minister whether the Goverment is prepared to take a decision and then follow it up on that basis?

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: As soon as we receive the decision of the BIFR, we would take take a decision.

श्री वीरेन्द्र कटारिया: चेयरमैन साहब, शुक्रिया। उर्दू का एक शेर है:-

फ़सादी सब घरों को जा चुके हैं
और मुहाफ़िज़ रात भर चौकस खड़े हैं।

छबड़िया साहब मुल्क की दौलत लूटकर कहीं जा चुके हैं और हम इसकी डिबेट कर रहे है।

†श्री वीरेन्द्र कटारिया: चेयरमैन صاحب، شکریہ - اردو کا ایک شعر ہے:
فسادی سب گھروں کو جا چکے ہیں
اور محافظ رات بھر چوکس کھڑے ہیں
چھابڑیا صاحب ملک کی دولت لوٹ کر
کہیں جا چکے ہیں اور ہم اس کی ڈیبیٹ
کر رہے ہیں۔

The issue raised by my colleague, Mr. Mukherjee, is very serious matter. It is not an isloated case. We have been hearing such cases for the last six years in this House and nothing has been done in any of the cases. The hon. Minister has said that the case is before the BIFR. May I know from the hon. Minister whether the BIFR has done anything to improve any sick unit that has been referred to it in the last six years? May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Government will reivew the working of the BIFR?

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the BIFR's functions are limited to assessment.

SHRI ASHOK MITRA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, this is an issue on which we find that there is a unanimity in the House both on the extreme right and the left whichever way you describe it. We know that BIFR is famous for its dilatoriness. It never reaches a decision or if it reaches a decision or decisions, they are always fussy in nature. Mean while shall we merely watch the situation to deteriorate from week to week and

†[ ] Transliteration is Arabic Script.

from month to month? We know exactly what happened in the case of the Shaw Wallace. The same is being repeated with this particular company. We can merely appeal to the Government and to the kind heartedness of the Minister of Industry, for a change let us decide and not talk. It is a simple decision which he can take right at this moment. If he doesn't do it, then, there would be very widespread implications of this.

Now, already our economic situation has given rise to very widespread comments outside the country that we have an unstable economy, that we are not managing our affairs and that we are rogue elephants to roll about freely bringing ruination of the economy. If you keep on repeating what this infamous person ensconced in Dubai did, there will be a further black-spot against our country's name. Kindly consider that aspect of the matter.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Mr. Chairman, Sir my heart goes out to the hon. Member, Shri Ashok Mitra. I fully appreciate his concern. I can assure him that this is a case where the Government is going to be pro-active to deal with the situation.

प्रो॰ विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: सभापति महोदय, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि यह जो मामला डनलप का है, शॉ वैलेस का है और बहुत सी कम्पनियों का है, इससे पहले क्या कोई पोलिटिकल और इनकी आपस में मिलीभगत थी जिसकी वजह से यह सब होता रहा? क्या पहले के जो मंत्री थे या पहले के जो राजनीतिज्ञ थे, उनके गठजोड़ से यह सब कुछ हुआ? ...(व्यवधान)...

It is a very, very serious matter.

यह आज इतनी गंभीर बात है, क्योंकि आपको चुभ रही है इसलिए आप कह रहे हैं।

I am not putting a question to you.

क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताएंगे कि 21 मार्च से पहले लगातार इतने सालों तक इन कंपनियों में जो धांधलियां होती रहीं, इनके ऊपर कोई ऐक्शन क्यों नहीं लिया गया? क्या पौलिटिशियंस और इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स, इनकी मिलीभगत से यह सारा काम हुआ?

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: मेरी नजर के सामने इस किस्म की कोई बात नहीं आई।

Working Women Hostels in Karnataka

*62. SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Will the Minister of SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of working women hostels established in Karnataka with the assistance of Welfare Ministry;

(b) the names and address of NGO's running the working women hostels in Karnataka and the grant given to each of them annually; and

(c) the number of working women staying in each hostel?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE EMPOWERMENT (SMT. MENAKA GANDHI): (a) 78 Working Women's Hostels have been sanctioned so far in Karnataka under the Scheme of assistance for construction/ Expansion of Hostel Building for Working Women with day Care Centre for Children being operated by the Department of Women & Child Development of the Ministry of Human Resource Development.

(b) A list giving names and addresses of the NGO's which have been sanctioned working women's hostels in Karnataka is laid on the Table of the House as *See* Appendix 184 Annexure No. 16. Only non-recurring grant is payable under the above Scheme towards cost of building construction and land. The Scheme does not involve payment of recurring or annual grants.

However, the Central Social Welfare Board, New Delhi gives grants for maintenance of working women's hostels.

A Statement showing grants sanctioned by the Board during 1997-98 is also laid on the Table of the House; as Annexure II *See* Appendix 184 Annexure No. 17.

(c) The capacity of the Hostels sanctioned under the Department's Scheme is mentioned in the list referred to in reply to part (b). The information on actual occupancy in each hostel is being collected from the State Government.

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN: Sir, the Government has assisted 78 working women's hostels in Karnataka. The Government is giving only non-recurring grants for construction of the